

**Remarks**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent. Claims 1-26 have been rejected. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, and 22 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors.

***Statutory Double Patenting***

Claims 1-26 have been provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-26 of co-pending Application No. 10/732,837. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims in the co-pending Application have been cancelled and replaced with new claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 19 have been objected to because of minor informalities. These claims have been amended to correct the informalities and not for reasons related to patentability. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1, 8, 9, and 19 be removed.

***Patentability of Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-24 over Chapel and Kern under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,009 to Chapel (“Chapel”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,157,552 to Kern et al. (“Kern”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites “a plurality of power information monitors disposed in the power distribution housing with at least one power information monitor being associated with at least said one power output and at least a second power information monitor being associated with at least said second power output.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any power information monitors of any type, much less of the type claimed or

within the environment of the monitors claimed, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Applicant respectfully submits that Kern does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter.

For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of an SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to a power information monitor, much less power information monitors disposed in a power distribution housing, which is recited by independent claim 1.

Therefore, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn from independent claim 1.

## Claim 2

Dependent claim 2 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of current determination circuits disposed in a power distribution housing, much less “a plurality of current determination circuits disposed in the power distribution housing with: (i) one current determination circuit intermediate said first phase current monitor and said one power output; and (ii) a second current determination circuit intermediate said second phase current monitor and said second power output,” which is recited by dependent claim 2.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 3

Dependent claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a housing that includes at least one vertical rack mounting element, much less a power distribution housing that “is elongated and includes at least one vertical rack mounting element whereby the elongated housing may be mounted to extend vertically adjacent an equipment rack,” which is recited by dependent claim 3.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Dependent claim 4 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein (i) said plurality of power outputs include at least a third power output being in power supply communication with a third power phase provided by the polyphase power input; and (ii) said plurality of power information monitors include a third power information monitor associated with said third power output,” as recited by dependent claim 4.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 5

Dependent claim 5 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein (i) said plurality of power outputs include at least a third power output being in power supply communication with a third power phase provided by the polyphase power input;(ii) said plurality of power information monitors include a third power information monitor, comprising a third current display, associated with said third power output; and(iii) said plurality of current determination circuits include a third current determination circuit intermediate said third phase current monitor and said third power output,” which is recited by dependent claim 5.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 6

Dependent claim 6 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral information monitor, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein the polyphase power input includes a neutral line and the plurality of power information monitors includes a neutral information monitor associated with the neutral line,” which is recited by dependent claim 6.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7

Dependent claim 7 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral information monitor, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein the polyphase power input includes a neutral line and the plurality of power information monitors includes a neutral information monitor, comprising a neutral current display, associated with the neutral line,” which is recited by dependent claim 7.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 10

Independent claim 10 recites “a plurality of power information displays disposed in the power distribution housing with at least one power information display being associated with said plurality of first phase power outputs and a second power information display being associated with said plurality of second phase power outputs.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any power information displays of any type, much less of the type claimed or within the environment of the displays claimed, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Applicant respectfully submits that Kern does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter.

For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of an SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to a power information display, much less power information displays disposed in a power distribution housing, which is recited by independent claim 10.

Therefore, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is

no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn from independent claim 10.

Claim 11

Dependent claim 11 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest power information displays disposed along an elongated power output face or a power distribution housing that may be mounted adjacent an electrical equipment rack, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein the power distribution housing (i) is elongated, (ii) has an elongated power output face, with the first phase power outputs, the second phase power outputs, and the power information displays disposed along said elongated power output face, and (iii) includes at least one rack mounting section, whereby the power distribution housing may be mounted adjacent an electronic equipment rack,” which is recited by dependent claim 11.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claim 12

Dependent claim 12 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “also including (i) a plurality of third phase power outputs disposed in the power distribution housing in power supply communication with a third power phase provided the polyphase power input; and (ii) a third power information

display among the plurality of power information displays and associated with the third phase power outputs,” which is recited by dependent claim 12.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 12 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 13

Dependent claim 13 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “also including (i) a plurality of third phase power outputs disposed in the power distribution housing, disposed along the elongated power output face, in power supply communication with a third power phase provided the polyphase power input; and (ii) a third power information display among the plurality of power information displays and associated with the third phase power outputs,” which is recited by dependent claim 13.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 13 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 14

Dependent claim 14 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of current display connected in collective current determining communication with multiple power outputs, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein each among each of said one and said second power information displays comprise a

current display connected in collective current determining communication with the associated plurality of power outputs for the power information display,” which is recited by dependent claim 14.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 14 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 15

Dependent claim 15 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral line information display, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein said polyphase power input includes a neutral line and wherein said plurality of power information displays includes a neutral line information display in communication with the neutral line,” which is recited by dependent claim 15.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 15 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 16

Dependent claim 16 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral line information display, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein said polyphase power input includes a neutral line and wherein said plurality of power information displays also includes a

neutral line information display in current determining communication with the neutral line,” which is recited by dependent claim 16.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 16 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 19

Independent claim 19 recites “means for displaying information regarding phase two power provided by the plurality of phase two output ports, said phase two displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any displaying means being disposed in a power distribution apparatus housing, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Applicant respectfully submits that Kern does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter.

For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of an SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to a displaying means being disposed in a power distribution housing, which is recited by independent claim 19.

Therefore, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 19. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn from independent claim 19.

#### Claim 20

Dependent claim 20 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a housing that includes a vertical rack mounting section, much less a power distribution housing

that a power distribution housing that “is elongated, has an elongated side to which the phase one displaying means and phase two displaying means are secured, and includes a vertical rack mounting section, whereby the power distribution apparatus may be vertically mounted adjacent a vertical side of an electronic equipment rack,” which is recited by dependent claim 20.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 20 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 21

Dependent claim 21 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus “including (i) a plurality of phase three output ports disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing, and (ii) means for displaying information regarding phase three power provided by the plurality of phase three output ports, said phase three displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing,” which is recited by dependent claim 21.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 21 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 22

Dependent claim 22 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input that includes a neutral line or a neutral line displaying means, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus “wherein (i) the polyphase power input includes a neutral

line and (ii) the polyphase power distribution apparatus also includes means for displaying information regarding the neutral line, said neutral line displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing,” which is recited by dependent claim 22.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 22 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 23

Dependent claim 23 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input that includes a neutral line or a neutral line displaying means, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus “wherein (i) the polyphase power input includes a neutral line and (ii) the polyphase power distribution apparatus also includes means for displaying information regarding the neutral line, said neutral line displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing,” which is recited by dependent claim 23.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 23 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 24

Dependent claim 24 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of sensory alarm, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus “wherein the phase one displaying means and phase two displaying means each include means for issuing a

sensory alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus,” which is recited by dependent claim 24.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 24 be withdrawn.

***Patentability of Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 25-26 over Chapel, Kern, and Arato  
under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,009 to Chapel (“Chapel”), U.S. Patent No. 6,157,552 to Kern et al. (“Kern”), and U.S. Patent 4,528,497 to Arato (“Arato”).

**Claim 8**

Dependent claim 8 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein each among the plurality of power information monitors includes a sensory alarm, whereby a human in the vicinity of the power distribution housing may automatically receive sensory stimulation from said sensory alarm,” which is recited by dependent claim 8.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 8 be withdrawn.

**Claim 9**

Dependent claim 9 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein each among the plurality of power information monitors includes a sensory alarm, whereby a human in the vicinity of the power distribution housing may automatically receive sensory stimulation from said sensory alarm,” which is recited by dependent claim 9.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 9 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 17

Dependent claim 17 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein each of the power information displays has an associated sensory alarm,” which is recited by dependent claim 17.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 17 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 18

Dependent claim 18 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus “wherein each of the power information displays has an associated audible alarm,” which is recited by dependent claim 18.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 25

Dependent claim 25 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus “wherein each displaying means includes means for issuing a sensory alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus,” which is recited by dependent claim 25.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claim 26

Dependent claim 26 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus “wherein each displaying means includes means for issuing an audible alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus,” which is recited by dependent claim 26.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 26 be withdrawn.

***Request for Examiner Interview***

The Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney to arrange for an Examiner Interview. This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

***Conclusion***

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims in their present form should be allowed. Early favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARCKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /s/ Justin D. Wagner  
Justin D. Wagner  
Registration No. 54,519